



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,073	09/28/2001	Yuki Wakita	214491US2X	3398
22850	7590	07/03/2006	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			PESIN, BORIS M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/965,073

Applicant(s)

WAKITA ET AL.

Examiner

Boris Pesin

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1- 38, 40-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-31, and 52- 63 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 32-38 and 40-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

This communication is responsive to the amendment filed 4/11/2006.

Claims 1- 38 and 40-63 are pending in this application and claims 1-31, and 52-63 are withdrawn. Claims 32, 35, 41, 49, 50, and 51 are independent claims. In the amendment filed 4/11/2006, Claims 32, 35, 41, 46, 49, 50 and 51 were amended. This action is made Non-Final.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 32-38, 39-47, 49, 50, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brozowski et al. (US 6559871).

In regards to claim 32, Brozowski teaches an object content structure management method for managing a content structure of a root object, wherein said root object includes attribute data corresponding to a media file, comprising:

expressing the content structure of said root object by a tree-structure set membership consisting of one or more objects, said one or more objects comprising one or more parent objects and one or more child objects, each child object respectively corresponding to one of said one or more parent objects (Column 5, Line 51- Column 6 Line 5) ;

defining an attribute capable of being held by said parent and child objects for each of a plurality of object types and each of the plurality of object types by a schema definition (Column 6 Lines 24-64);

managing a list of child objects capable of being held by said root object and defined by said schema definition (Column 6 Lines 24-64); and

sequentially managing a list of first child objects of one of said one or more parent objects as a start object, a list of the first child objects of each start object held by the list of the first child objects, and a second list of child objects of each first child object held by a second list of child objects of the first child objects, thereby managing a content structure of said start object (See Figure 2 and Column 5, Line 51- Column 6 Line 5), wherein:

said first and second lists of child objects hold instances of all objects actually existing as said child objects and placeholders indicating objects that can exist as said child objects (Column 13, Lines 21-48);

each child object holds determination information for determining whether a certain object is an instance of an actually existing child object or a placeholder indicating an object that can exist as a child object (Column 13, Lines 21-48).

In regards to claim 33, Brozowski teaches an object content structure management method according to claim 32, wherein: said placeholders indicate objects that can exist as said child objects and are managed one by one for each object of a same type (Column 13, Lines 21-48).

In regards to claim 34, Brozowski teaches an object content structure management method according to claim 32, further comprising: managing a plurality of objects including an exclusively selectable object that is capable of being held by a certain parent object by a schema definition of said parent object as a choice list besides said list of child objects (See Figure 2);

managing an object selected from among a plurality of choices by a list of child objects of a parent object and managing objects other than said selected object of the choices as said placeholders indicating objects that can exist as child objects in the choice list of said selected object (See Figure 2).

In regards to claim 35, Brozowski teaches an object content structure display method for displaying a content structure of a root object, wherein said root object includes attribute data corresponding to a media file, comprising:

expressing the content structure of said object by a tree-structure set membership consisting of one or more objects, said one or more objects comprising one or more parent objects and one or more child objects, each child object respectively corresponding to one of said one or more parent objects (Column 5, Line 51- Column 6 Line 5);

defining an attribute capable of being held by said parent and child objects for each of a plurality of object types and a type of said object by a schema definition, wherein (Column 6 Lines 24-64):

objects held by said root object as child objects are expressed by a tree structure (Column 5, Line 51- Column 6 Line 5);

a character string representing this object type is displayed on each node of the tree structure to display a structure of the object (See Figure 2); and

a type and a value of the attribute capable of being held by an object selected from the displayed tree structure are displayed (See Figure 2).

In regards to claim 36, Brozowski teaches an object content structure display method according to claim 35, wherein: not only instance objects actually held by the root object, but also placeholders indicating objects that can be held based on the schema definition, are simultaneously displayed in the tree structure one by one, for each object type (Column 13, Lines 21-48); and the instance objects and the objects other than the instance objects are discriminated by different icons and then displayed (Column 13, Lines 21-48).

In regards to claim 37, Brozowski teaches an object content structure display method according to claim 35, wherein: said tree structure is expressed hierarchically for objects to be held by said root object serving as a root configured to further hold objects (See Figure 2); and structures below the actually existing instance objects are displayed up to a hierarchical level designated at a time of hierarchically displaying

said tree structure and display of structures below the designated hierarchical level is omitted (See Figure 2, the user chooses which nodes to see or not).

In regards to claim 38, Brozowski teaches An object content structure display method according to claim 35, wherein: any one of a plurality of types of objects may be held under a schema definition of types of child objects capable of being held by the root object (See Figure 2 and Column 13, Lines 21-48); all objects of choices are displayed in a tree structure as child nodes and the objects actually selected and held among the choices and the unselected choices are discriminated from each other by different icons and then displayed (See Figure 2 and Column 13, Lines 21-48).

In regards to claim 40, Brozowski teaches an object content structure display method according to claim 35, wherein: a plurality of child objects of a same type may be held under a schema definition of types of the child objects capable of held by the root object (Column 13, Lines 21-48); and one of a maximum number and a minimum number of the child objects capable of being held are displayed in said tree structure (See Figure 2).

In regards to claim 41, Brozowski teaches an object content structure editing method for editing a content structure of a root object, wherein said root object includes attribute data corresponding to a media file, comprising:

expressing the content structure of said object by a tree-structure set membership consisting of one or more objects, said one or more objects comprising one or more parent objects and one or more child objects, each child object

respectively corresponding to one of said one or more parent objects (Column 5, Line 51- Column 6 Line 5);

defining an attribute capable of being held by said parents and child objects for each of a plurality of object types and a type of said object by a schema definition (Column 6 Lines 24-64), wherein

objects held by said parent object as child objects are expressed by a tree structure (See Figure 2);

a character string representing the object type is displayed on each node of the tree structure to display a structure of the object (See Figure 2);

a type and a value of an attribute capable of being held by an object selected from the displayed tree structure are displayed (See Figure 2 and Column 13, Lines 21-48);

and a value to be changed is inputted and a change is indicated for said displayed attribute value, and the attribute value of the object is updated to the input value (Column 13, Lines 49-58).

In regards to claim 42, Brozowski teaches an object content structure editing apparatus according to claim 41, wherein: an instance addition is indicated after one of the objects existing in the tree structure is designated (Column 13, Lines 49-58); and an instance object of the same type as a type of the designated object is created and the object of the same type is displayed as a fraternal node of said designated object in the tree structure (Column 5, Line 51- Column 6 Line 5 and Column 13, Lines 49-58).



In regards to claim 43, Brozowski teaches an object content structure editing method according to claim 42, wherein: an object permitted to be held as a plural by the schema definition is discriminated from an object prohibited from being held as a plural by the schema definition using different display colors or different icons prior to being displayed; and instance addition indication is not accepted in cases of objects prohibited from being held as a plural (Column 13, Lines 49-58).

In regards to claim 44, Brozowski teaches an object content structure editing method according to claim 41, wherein: an addition is indicated after designating one dummy object indicating types of objects which do not actually exist but can be held; said designated dummy object is changed to an actual instance; and an icon of said designated dummy object is changed to an icon indicating the actual instance in the tree structure (Column 13, Lines 21-48, and Column 13, Lines 49-58).

In regards to claim 45, Brozowski teaches an object content structure editing method according to claim 44, wherein: not only said designated dummy object but also ancestor objects of said designated dummy object are dummy objects (Column 13, Lines 21-48); and the ancestor objects are sequentially changed to instances (Column 13, Lines 21-48, and Column 13, Lines 49-58).

In regards to claim 46, Brozowski teaches an object content structure editing method according to claim 41, wherein:

deletion is indicated after designating the object selected from the displayed tree structure (See Figure 2, the user is able to select which items to view or not using the + sign);

said designated object is held as a plural (See Figure 2);

structures below the objects are deleted and display of the objects is deleted from the tree structure (See Figure 2, the user is able to select which items to view or not using the + sign);

the deletion is indicated after designating the actually existing object and said designated object is a single object (See Figure 2);

and nodes below the designated object are changed to dummy objects and display icons of the nodes in the tree structure are changed (Column 13, Lines 21-48, and Column 13, Lines 49-58).

In regards to claim 47, Brozowski teaches an object content structure editing method according to claim 41, wherein: a selection change is indicated after one of dummy objects indicating unselected choices is designated (See Figure 2); and the objects selected before the selection change are changed to the objects indicating choices and said designated object is changed to a selected object (See Figure 2, and Column 13, Lines 21-48, and Column 13, Lines 49-58).

Claim 49 is in the same context as claim 32; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 50 is in the same context as claim 35; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 51 is in the same context as claim 41; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Brozowski et al. (US 6559871).

In regards to claim 48, Brozowski teaches all the limitations of claim 41. He does not specifically teach that edited object contents are outputted by a description language, the description language being an MPEG-7 description language or an XML description language. Official notice is given that it is well known in the art to output contents of an object in XML description language. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to output contents of an object in XML description language with the motivation to provide the user with greater flexibility.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 32-38 and 40-51 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Inquiry***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris Pesin whose telephone number is (571) 272-4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BP

  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100